

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

REMZI ARIFI,

Plaintiff,

v.

**FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE SYSTEM,
INC., dba FEDEX PACKAGE
DISTRIBUTION CENTER,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:13-cv-001871-AC

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta issued a Findings and Recommendation in this case on July 13, 2015. Dkt. 29. Judge Acosta recommended that Defendant's motion for summary judgment be granted. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, however, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”). Nor does the Act “preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. And the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

As no party has objected, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Acosta’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.¹ Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS Judge Acosta’s Findings and Recommendation (Dkt. 29). Defendant’s motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 19) is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 28th day of July, 2015.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
 Michael H. Simon
 United States District Judge

¹ Were this Court reviewing the F&R under a *de novo* standard, Plaintiff’s hostile-work-environment claim might survive summary judgment. In the absence of objections, however, the appropriate standard of review is clear error—a much higher bar. The Court declines to hold that summary judgment on Plaintiff’s hostile-work-environment claim was clearly erroneous.